



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/961,081	09/21/2001	Yoram Ofek	SYN 1776	6753
20787	7590	10/03/2005	EXAMINER	
SITRICK & SITRICK 8340 N LINCOLN AVENUE SUITE 201 SKOKIE, IL 60077			CHANG, RICHARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2663	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/961,081

Applicant(s)

OFEK ET AL.

Examiner

Richard Chang

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code in page 8, line 7. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-23, 26-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by US patent No. 6,498,794 ("Tsukamoto et al.").

Regarding claims 1, 21, 27, 43 and 54, Tsukamoto et al. teach a transmitter equipped with a cell switching function, covering rate from DS1 to OC-48, adapted for mapping of synchronous frames containing a plurality of input channels (3), and at least one output channel (5) (See Fig. 1) comprising:

a Common Time Reference (Synchronous frame), divided into a plurality of contiguous time frames (cell), wherein the time frames (cells) have a plurality of predefined time durations (period) and mapping positions of the individual multiplexed channel are predetermined, and

means (4) for mapping into each of the time frames (cells) for each of the output channels (5), from a respective subset of the time frames for respective ones of the input channels (3), where Input and output channels are connected via adaptive OC-n interface to support aggregated speed (See Fig. 1, Col. 5, lines 16-35).

Regarding claims 31 and 56, Tsukamoto et al. further teach a demapping method of synchronous frames applicable to a plurality of output channels (11), and at least one input channel (7) comprising:

providing a Common Time Reference (Synchronous frame), dividing the CTR into a plurality of contiguous time frames (cell), wherein the time frames (cell) 9have a plurality of predefined time durations, and

mapping (8) for each respective one of the time frames from the respective input channel (7) 9to at least one time frame of at least one of the output channels (11) (See Fig. 2, Col. 5, lines 37-55).

Regarding claim 2, as discussed above, this claim has limitation that is similar to those of claims 1, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 above.

Regarding claims 3 and 44, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 1 and 43, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 and 43 above.

Regarding claims 4, 22 and 45, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 3, 21 and 44, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 3, 21 and 44 above.

Regarding claims 5, 23 and 46, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 3, 21 and 44, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 3, 21 and 44 above.

Regarding claims 6 and 47, as discussed above, this claim has limitation that is similar to those of claims 3 and 44, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 3 and 44 above.

Regarding claims 7 and 48, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 3, 44, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 3, 44 above.

Regarding claims 8 and 49, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 3 and 44, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 3 and 44 above.

Regarding claims 9 and 50, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 1, 43, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 and 43 above.

Art Unit: 2663

Regarding claims 10 and 51, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 1 and 43, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 and 43 above.

Regarding claims 11 and 52, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 1 and 43, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 and 43 above.

Regarding claims 12, 29 and 53, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 11, 27 and 52, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 11, 27 and 52 above.

Regarding claims 13, 28 and 55, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 1, 27 and 54, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1, 27 and 54 above.

Regarding claim 14, as discussed above, this claim has limitation that is similar to those of claim 10, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 10 above.

Regarding claim 15, as discussed above, this claim has limitation that is similar to those of claim 10, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 10 above.

Regarding claims 16-17, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claim 1, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 18, 26 and 30, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 1, 21 and 27, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1, 21 and 27 above.

Regarding claim 19-20, as discussed above, this claim has limitation that is similar to those of claim 1, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 32 and 57, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 31 and 56, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 31 and 56 above.

Regarding claims 33 and 58, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 31 and 56, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 31 and 56 above.

Regarding claims 34 and 59, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 31 and 56, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 31 and 56 above.

Regarding claims 35 and 60, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 31 and 56, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 31 and 56 above.

Regarding claims 36 and 61, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 31 and 56, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 31 and 56 above.

Art Unit: 2663

Regarding claims 37 and 62, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claims 31 and 56, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 31 and 56 above.

Regarding claims 38-39, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claim 37, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 37 above.

Regarding claims 40-41, as discussed above, these claims have limitation that is similar to those of claim 31, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 31 above.

Regarding claim 42, as discussed above, this claim has limitation that is similar to those of claim 31, and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 31 above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent No. 6,498,794 ("Tsukamoto et al.") in view of US patent 6,496,519 ("Russell et al.").



Regarding Claims 24-25, as discussed above, Tsukamoto et al. teaches substantially all the claimed invention but did not disclose expressly the particular application involving limitations of

“the output channels from a first plurality of the grooming subsystems are coupled to the input channels of a first separate one of the grooming subsystems, to provide a first grooming output”, and

the output channels from a second plurality of the grooming subsystems are coupled to the input channels of a second separate one of the grooming subsystems, to provide a second grooming output; wherein the system is further comprised of a third grooming subsystem, wherein the first and second grooming outputs are coupled to the input channels of the third grooming subsystem”.

Russell et al. teaches a frame based data transmission over a synchronous digital loop where the output channels from a first plurality of the subsystems (1005-1029) are coupled to the input channels of a first separate one of the subsystems (1044), to provide a first output and the output channels from a second plurality of the subsystems are coupled to the input channels of a second separate one of the subsystems, to provide a second output, wherein the system is further comprised of a third subsystem, wherein the first and second outputs are coupled to the input channels of the third subsystem (1077) (See Fig. 10, Col. 9, lines 47-63).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Russell et al. in Tsukamoto et al. in order to obtain a cell switching function adapted for mapping of synchronous frames containing a plurality of input channels and one output channel

and to take advantage of synchronous multiplexing with a frame based data transmission over a synchronous digital loop in claims 24-25.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to take advantage of synchronous multiplexing with a frame based data transmission over a synchronous digital loop, as suggested by Russell et al. in Col. 9, lines 47-63. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Russell et al. with the Tsukamoto et al. to obtain the inventions specified in claims 24-25.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3129. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Rur*

rkc

Richard Chang  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2663

  
DERRICK MORRIS  
PATENT EXAMINER  
9/30/01